



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/873,879	05/29/2001	Romain L. Billiet		5124

7590

11/03/2003

R. L. BILLIET
135A MALACCA STREET
PENANG, 10400
MALAYSIA

EXAMINER

TRAN, LEN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1725

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/873,879

Applicant(s)

BILLIET ET AL.

Examiner

Len Tran

Art Unit

1725

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 24-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24-33,35,36,38 and 39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 34 and 37 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/873,879	BILLIET ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Len Tran	1725	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Len Tran. (3) _____.

(2) Mr. Martin Cosenza. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 16 September 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant indicates that the should not be a FINAL. Examiner agrees to send a NON-Final action.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

This office action replaces the rescinded office action mailed on August 8, 2003.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 24-33, 35, 36, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amaya et al (US 5,976,457), and further in view of Wiech, Jr. (US 5,234,655).

Amaya et al disclose the rapid and accurate method of producing molding tools comprising the steps of providing a standard base mold (51), milling the pockets in the mold

Art Unit: 1725

base, fabricating an interchangeable insert (50) having mounting surface matching the pockets, and securing the insert to the base pocket. The *insert is produced by metal powder injection molding* (figures 1-8) (col. 9, lines 39-42, lines 54-67, col. 10, lines 1-60). The method allows improved dimensional accuracy and reduction of surface texture inconsistency. The resulting mold includes coordinates reference points or other similar design features. The resulting mold can be used to cast materials such as aluminum or zinc.

However, Amaya et al fails to disclose the injection of ceramic powder in an organic binder comprises approximately 60% by volume of a fine grain alpha aluminum oxide that has been milled to its ultimate crystal size and approximately 40% by volume of a thermoplastic binder mixture.

Wiech, Jr. discloses discloses the injection of ceramic powder in an organic binder comprises approximately 60% by volume of a fine grain alpha aluminum oxide that has been milled to its ultimate crystal size and approximately 40% by volume of a thermoplastic binder mixture for the purpose of size reduction, packing density, heat dissipation, conductor geometry and complex interconnection problems are substantially reduced (col. 3, lines 1-6, col. 6, lines 20-45, col. 7, lines 52-59).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time applicant's invention was made to provide ceramic powder as taught by Wiech, Jr., in Amaya et al since size, packing density, heat dissipation, complex interconnection problems are substantially reduced.

Art Unit: 1725

4. Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amaya et al (US 5,976,457) in view of Wiech, Jr. (US 5,234,655), in view of Ryuhgoh et al (US 5,432,224).

Amaya et al and Wiech, Jr. disclose the claimed invention in paragraph 3, but fail to teach adding stearic acid to the binder mixture.

However, Ryuhgoh et al disclose using stearic acid with ceramic powder and binder as a plasticizer or lubricant.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time applicant's invention was made to combine stearic acid as taught by Ryuhgoh et al, in Amaya et al and Wiech, Jr. in order to lubricate the ceramic powder and binder.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 34 and 37 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior arts of record fail to teach 60% by volume of the fine grain alpha aluminum oxide is a calcined alumina with an average particle size of less than 0.5 microns and shrinking the green articles by about 17%.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 24-39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Inquiry


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Len Tran whose telephone number is (703)605-1175. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Dunn can be reached on 703-308-3318. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)305-3602 for regular communications and (703)305-3602 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0661.

Len Tran
Examiner
Art Unit 1725

LT
October 3, 2003


M. ALEXANDRA ELVE
PRIMARY EXAMINER